## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JON PLISKA, CV 05-1155-AS

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

RENT-A-CENTER WEST, INC. (d.b.a. RENT-A-CENTER and f.k.a. RENT-A-CENTER, INC.); and TODD FUNK, an individual,

v.

Defendants.

## ASHMANSKAS, Magistrate Judge:

Defendant Rent-a-Center West, Inc. ("RAC") has appealed an order of this court, which held that plaintiff's first three claims for relief are arbitrable while the last three claims are not. Currently before the court is the motion of RAC and co-defendant, Todd Funk, to stay all proceedings in this case pending resolution of the appeal filed by RAC. For the reasons that follow, defendants' motion (No. 31) is GRANTED.

///

Page -1- OPINION AND ORDER

Case 3:05-cv-01155-AS Document 41 Filed 04/03/06 Page 2 of 2

<u>DISCUSSION</u>

The Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) provides that a district court's order denying an order to

compel arbitration is immediately appealable. 9 USC § 16(a)(1)(C). A district court's order to stay

trial proceedings while such an appeal is pending is committed to the discretion of the trial court.

Britton v. Co-op Banking Group, 916 F.2d 1405, 1412 (9th Cir. 1990). The Ninth Circuit has

previously noted that "[i]f a litigant must undergo the expense and delay of a trial before being able

to appeal, the advantages of arbitration—speed and economy—are lost forever." <u>International Ass'n</u>

of Machinists v. Aloha Airlines, 776 F.2d 812, 815 (9th Cir. 1985) (internal quotation marks and

citations omitted). That reasoning applies here.

If RAC is required to litigate plaintiff's Fourth, Fifth and Sixth claims in this court, and its

appeal is subsequently successful, RAC will have lost the benefit it was intended to have under the

Arbitration Agreement. Moreover, if RAC's appeal is successful, litigating plaintiff's Fourth, Fifth

and Sixth claims will have been a waste of judicial resources. These interests will be best served

by an order staying the trial proceedings during the pendency of RAC's appeal.

**CONCLUSION** 

For these reasons, defendants' motion to stay proceedings (No. 31) is GRANTED.

DATED this 31st day of March, 2006.

/s/Donald C. Ashmanskas

DONALD C. ASHMANSKAS

United States Magistrate Judge

Page -2- OPINION AND ORDER